

REMARKS

The present application was filed on January 26, 2004 with claims 1-3. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice and claims 1 and 3 remain pending. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,034,653 (hereinafter “Robertson”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,485,172 (hereinafter “Sawachika”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,452,572 (hereinafter “Fan”).

Applicants have amended claim 1 and canceled claim 3 in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendment and cancellation are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite an opaque light shield having a closed position wherein an image signal is viewed by the user with background light blocked from entering the optical system and thereby eliminated. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at, for example, page 13, lines 1-12.

Applicants respectfully assert that the combined references fail to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned limitation of amended claim 1 directed to an opaque light shield having a closed position wherein an image signal is viewed by the user with background light blocked from entering the optical system and thereby eliminated.

As previously noted, Robertson discloses an interface pod that is transmissive or see-through. See Robertson at col. 8, lines 10-25. Fan discloses a protective shade that completely covers a display in a display housing when closed, such that when the protective covering in Fan is in the closed position, anything displayed in the optical system cannot be seen. See Fan, col. 23, lines 40-46, and FIG. 54.

Sawachika discloses, with emphasis added, a “tinted, or smoked, visor portion . . . for reducing an amount of ambient light.” See Sawachika at column 3, lines 22-24. Indeed, Sawachika teaches away from the aforementioned limitation by teaching an arrangement wherein “since ambient

outside light is admitted . . . the user may view the displayed image while it is still possible to visually monitor the surroundings.” See Sawachika at column 4, lines 10-13.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the combined references fail to teach or suggest at least the limitation of amended claim 1 wherein an opaque light shield has a closed position wherein an image signal is viewed by the user with background light blocked from entering the optical system and thereby eliminated.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Lewis  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 39,274  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560  
(516) 759-2946

Date: June 20, 2008